

**Serial No. 10/085,527
Atty. Doc. No. 99P03591WOUS**

REMARKS

Applicant has amended claims 1, 18, and 21-22, and added new claims 26-28. Thus, claims 1-10, 12-13, and 18-28 are presented for examination. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Response to Examiner's objection to priority:

Applicant has amended specification to claim priority as a continuation of International Application No. PCT/EP00/08049. Applicant therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to priority.

Response to Examiner's objection to the specification:

Applicant has amended the paragraph beginning on page 5 line 30 of the specification replacing the term "normal" with the term "tangent". Applicant therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the specification.

Response to Examiner's rejections under section 103:

Claims 1-10, 12-13, and 18-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner contending that these claims are unpatentable over Taylor et al. (USPN 5,520,516) alone or in view of McCombs et al. (USPN Re. 35611), and further in view of Kaiba et al. (US 6,096,132).

Examiner's position is that one skilled in the art with a need to uniformly roughen a metal surface to prepare the surface to accept a ceramic coating, would have first turned to Taylor, which is directed toward a method to create micro-cracks in a zirconia-based tipped blade, and then, based on Taylor, would have found it obvious to turn to McCombs, which is directed toward high pressure blasting of a ceramic coated surface, and then, based on McCombs, would have found it obvious to turn to Kaiba, which is directed toward spraying paint on an automobile, in order to fulfill the need to uniformly roughen a metal surface to prepare the surface to accept a ceramic coating, as claimed by Applicant.

Applicant respectfully notes that it is impermissible to "pick and choose from any one reference only so much of it as will support a given position to the exclusion of other parts necessary to the full appreciation of what such reference fairly suggests to one skilled in the art."

**Serial No. 10/085,527
Atty. Doc. No. 99P03591WOUS**

Bausch & Lomb v. Barnes-Hind/Hydrocurve, 230 USPQ 416, 419 (Fed. Cir. 1986) (quoting In Re Wesslau, 147 USPQ 391, 393 (CCPA 1965)). A fair reading of Taylor teaches a method of roughening a turbine blade tip by spraying a ceramic coating with particular parameters to produce macro-cracks of a particular orientation and length to improve wear resistance of the blade tip. Taylor does not teach and would not fairly direct one skilled in the art to prepare a surface by grit blasting such that a uniform roughness is produced. At most, Taylor discloses that grit blasting a surface improves its bond strength, but this well known fact does nothing to teach or suggest using abrasive grit blasting to obtain a uniform roughness.

Even more so, one looking to abrasively grit blast a metallic surface would not turn to McComas, which fairly teaches using a high pressure water jet to remove a ceramic coating from a metallic surface. The requirements to remove ceramic material from a metallic surface using a water jet are very different than the requirements to uniformly roughen a metal surface by grit blasting to accept a ceramic coating. A ceramic coating is very brittle whereas metals are more ductile and have a higher toughness that would be best roughened via grit blasting.

Moreover, one skilled in the art then would not turn to the automotive painting industry in order to learn how to uniformly roughen a metal surface by grit blasting to accept a ceramic coating. Again, the requirements to uniformly roughen a curved metal surface by grit blasting to accept a ceramic coating are different than painting an automobile having large, flat panels.

Notwithstanding the above, Applicant's claimed invention, as amended, recites obtaining a desired contour line geometry data for the metal component and measuring an actual contour line geometry of the curved surface and inputting the actual geometry data into a control system; comparing the actual geometry data with the desired contour line geometry data. Neither Kaiba nor any of the cited art suggests or teaches comparing a measured component geometry to a desired component geometry. Rather, Kaiba teaches an automobile paint sprayer having fixed spray heads that travels in the X, Y, and Z directions relative to a stationary automobile whereas Applicant's claimed invention teaches surface preparation of a metal component using a grit blasting device having motion in the X and Y directions and a spray head capable of rotating in the X-Y plane relative to a rotating metal component.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 18 are patentable. Dependent claims 2-10, 12-14 and 19-28 are patentable based upon their dependency from claims 1 and 18 as well as on their own merit. For example, dependent claims 26-28 are

**Serial No. 10/085,527
Atty. Doc. No. 99P03591WOUS**

directed toward rotating the metal component relative to the spray jet and a pivoting spray head that moves in two directions. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103 rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the objections and rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action are inapplicable to the present claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the objections and rejections and timely pass the application to allowance. Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this paper. The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including the fees specified in 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 (c), 1.17(a)(1) and 1.20(d) for total independent claims in excess of 3, or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 8/6/04

By: J.P. Musone

John P. Musone

Registration No. 44,961

(407) 736-6449

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830